REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 24-37 are currently pending in the present application, none of which has been amended.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 24-25, 27, 29-32, 34 and 36-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chee* (US 5,694,141) in view of *Ranganathan* (US 5,764,201). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 24 and 31) recites a step of "in response to a selection of a split display mode, retaining information in said first memory location and updating information in said second memory location, such that contents displayed on said first display device are different from contents displayed on said second display device."

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts the claimed step of "retaining information in said first memory location and updating information in said second memory location" is disclosed by *Chee* in col. 17, lines 45-54. Col. 17, lines 45-54 of *Chee* states

> However, the display FIFO's 56 and 56' will be allowed sufficient access to the DRAM 38 that the FIFO's do not run out of display data originating with the particular memory spaces 100' and 102'. Accordingly, although the accesses to the DRAM 38 are intermittent for each of the display FIFO's 56 and 56', the displays 14/24 and 14/24' will each be supplied simultaneously with different display data. That is, the user of the computer system 10 will see a different image presented on the displays 14 and 24 simultaneously.

Although *Chee* discloses the displaying of different images on two different displays, it is clear from the above-cited passage that *Chee* does not teach or suggest "retaining information in said first memory location and updating information in said second memory location," as claimed.

Claim 1 also recites a step of "in response to a selection of a concurrent display mode, providing identical information to said first and second memory locations, such that contents displayed on said first display device are identical to contents displayed on said second display device."

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that *Chee* does not teach or suggest the displaying of identical contents on the same two display devices; however, the Examiner asserts that it is disclosed by *Ranganathan* in Figure 10A. Although *Ranganathan* discloses the displaying of the same image on two different displays, *Ranganathan* does not teach or suggest "providing identical information to said first and second memory locations," as claimed.

In addition, *Ranganathan* discloses the usage of a single memory, such as a memory 56 in Figures 4-8. However, *Ranganathan* does not teach or suggest the claimed steps of "allocating a first memory location for storing contents to be displayed by said first display device" and "allocating a second memory location for storing contents to be displayed by said second display device."

Because the cited references, whether separately or combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-7 and 24-37 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1, 24 and 31 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against Lenovo Deposit Account No. 50-3533.

Respectfully submitted,

Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS